

RADIO FREE EUROPE  
MUNICH, GERMANY  
RUMANIAN DEPARTMENT

PROGRAM TITLE: POLITICAL BLOCK, No. 131  
AIR DATE: MAY 11th, 1967  
LENGTH: 38 MINUTES  
AUTHOR: JOHN HARALAMB  
TRANSLATOR: C.V.

Ceausescu on the Communist Party's role in Rumanian life.

HARALAMB: In a lengthy article published in the May 7th issue of SCANTEIA, Nicholas Ceausescu tries to explain the role which, in his conception, the Communist Party should be performing in the Rumanian nation's public life. This role has been specified by the new Constitution, as well as approved by the National Assembly, which, unfortunately, only had the significance of a rubber stamp. Indeed, the text of the Constitution, which proclaims the Rumanian Communist Party's priority, was imposed on the National Assembly and on the nation by the Communist Party.

And what did Ceausescu add to this Party priority inserted in the Constitution at the Party's own request? The Constitution foresees full sovereignty for the Rumanian nation, but it practically confiscates it later by telling us that the Communist Party is the only leading power of the whole society.

Nicholas Ceausescu is telling us today that during the new stage which Rumania is now experiencing, the Party must increase its responsibilities. And why? Because, according to the Secretary-General's belief, the Party is becoming increasingly integrated into the nation's public life. And thus, supposedly, will unity between Party and population become deeper. But, must indeed a priority exist within this unity? Why does Ceausescu point out that this unity deepens the Party's leading role all over the country? Indeed, Ceausescu mentions the continuous consolidation of internal unity, between Party and population, and also the merger of social classes, but he seems not to be aware that if the nation becomes confused with the Party and the Party with the nation, the question could be raised: why is the nation not authorized to speak? Why, indeed, will the nation not become the effective leading power in the state? Why, indeed, is this sovereign power--which according to Ceausescu is now fully identical with the Party's aspirations and objectives--not invested with a leading role, with the control of the executive power, to be able thus to assert its sovereign attributions?

Ceausescu does not answer these obvious questions, but he asserts that relations between Party and state require, in the present phase, corresponding forms of organization. In this regard, Ceausescu does not admit openly and explicitly the

Yugoslav doctrine of separation between Party and state, but he makes it understood that the one and the other must be given different attributions so that a sort of sterile parallelism may disappear, which--practically speaking--would only result in the same duties for the Party as well as for the state.

The Party Secretary-General also refers to the increasing role of the mass organizations, i.e., of the Trade Unions, the Youth Organizations, and the Women's Associations, etc., but he does not tell us how the ever-increasing mission of these organizations would be reflected within the structures as set up by the new status adopted at the latest Party Congress. Of course, Ceausescu also mentions the impetus these so-called "creative unions" would give the country's cultural and artistic life, since--as he tells us--"all the advanced ideas emanate from the Party."

And for the Party, which claims to be monolithic, Leninist, and totalitarian, contradictions apparently do not have a price; Ceausescu indeed proclaims the primacy of Communism--of mankind--but he disrespects it at the same time under the avalanche of state constraints, i.e., of Party constraints.

If these are the elements determining a renewal, or better said, an aggravation of the Party's authoritarian role, it was obvious indeed that Ceausescu should have signalled the fact that positive rights must be reflected in the new structure of public relations. To what an extent, indeed, should legal norms be revised so as to better correspond to all the demands of present realities? The state is, or must be, the nation's legal representation. And at the same time it must also reflect the nation's realities with the help of representative institutions, as well as guide the nation by exercising a controlled executive power. This, indeed, is the necessary starting point of a legal right within which the law would no longer have discriminating significance, but only that of an equal norm valid for all. Besides, does not Ceausescu himself mention the absolute necessity of ensuring the full performance of the citizen's rights and freedom?

For the moment, Ceausescu evokes the possible progress of internal democracy within the Party, but, together with his customary political and ideological zig-zag, he stresses the necessity of an increasing discipline within the Party. Nonetheless, the Secretary-General can not just ignore the necessity of free discussions on all the problems of public interest; should not the sincere confrontation of opinions to this effect be asserted by the granting of greater freedom?